



AR IJW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: :
Kevin C. Johnson, et al. :
 :
Application No.: 09/881,533 :
 :
Filed: June 14, 2001 :
 :
For: SALES TAX ASSESSMENT, :
REMITTANCE AND COLLECTION SYSTEM :
 :
 :
Attorney Docket No.: TAX002.10002 :

Group Art Unit: 3627

Examiner: A.J. Fischer

I, John F. Letchford, Registration No. 33,328, certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 24, 2007.



John F. Letchford

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 41.41

This Reply Brief comes before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Board of Appeals and Interferences ("Board") in response to a "second" Examiner's Answer dated June 5, 2007 (and a substantially identical "first" Examiner's Answer dated July 18, 2007, collectively, "Examiner's Answers"). It does not include any new or non-admitted amendment or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence.

I. WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

Appellants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 156-170 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Chong (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,169).

II. RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Appellants have discussed the presently claimed invention and the details and merits of its several independent claims, claims 156, 157, 171, 184, 194, 214 and 220 at great length in their Appeal Brief dated June 2, 2006. Accordingly, in the interest of economy, the instant discussion is limited to (1) new objections/arguments raised in the Examiner's Answers and (2) certain discussions of facts and statements of law reasserted in the second Examiner's Answer that Appellants are justifiably concerned the Examiner would again raise given multiple opportunities to reconsider them in light of their obvious inapplicability to the claims on appeal.

A. NEW OBJECTIONS/ARGUMENTS

At page 14, lines 1-5, of the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 of the Examiner's Answers under the heading "(10) Response to Argument," the Examiner cites certain "discrepancies" in the Table spanning pages 26-35 of Appellants' Brief filed June 2, 2006. The Table in question was offered in response to an objection made by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection dated December 23, 2004. More specifically, the Table was offered in good faith in reply to the Examiner's odd assertion at page 6, ¶ 13 of the FINAL rejection that none of the claims 156-224 in the application (of which all but one

claim, claim 177, remains on appeal), find express support in the several provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority. That Table pointed out with specificity where support for the claimed invention was present in one or more of the six (6) provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority, and acknowledged where those provisional applications did not provide express support for a few of the claims on appeal.

The "discrepancies" identified by the Examiner at page 14 of the Examiner's Answers fall into two categories: (a) an objection based on the failure of provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 to show a "Figure 12" as suggested in the Table, and (b) an objection to the effect that another provisional patent from which Appellants' claim priority in the instant application, Serial No. 60/218,196, fails to offer specific support for certain subject matter called for in claim 170 on appeal.

1. Discrepancy (a)

The disputed Table was created with great time and care by the undersigned, and at considerable expense to Appellants, in response to the aforementioned objection raised by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection. That notwithstanding, the Examiner is correct, provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does not include a figure identified as "Figure 12." The undersigned hereby avers that any reference in the Table to "Figure 12" of Appellants' provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 was an inadvertent and unintentional typographical error. The undersigned extends his sincere apologies to the Examiner for any confusion or misunderstanding

that that typographical error may have been created in the Examiner's mind. That aside, the undersigned hereby reaffirms that provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does contain specific support for every other claim limitation for which it is cited in the Table.

2. Discrepancy (b)

The Examiner correctly notes that claim 170 on appeal requires "archiving said new client database on a computer-readable medium." The Examiner then states (with emphasis added in italics) "While the provisional [Serial No. 60/218,196] states, 'Upon date-tagging and saving, the respective client files are archived at step 16, a copy of the client database is returned to the client at step 18'" *thereby only giving support for the step of archiving and not providing support for what the database is archived on.* Appellants respectfully submit to the reviewing members of the Board will surely appreciate that the step of "saving" following the step of "date-tagging" quite clearly suggests to a person of even less than ordinary skill in the art of the present invention that the date-tagged and saved/archived information is archived "on a computer readable medium" as expressed in claim 170 on appeal. This is especially true since Appellants' entire invention -- as disclosed throughout the protracted history of the present application as well in its many predecessors -- is directed to a computer-based invention in which information is stored on a computer-readable medium.

B. REPEATED ERRORS OF FACTS AND LAW

In the FINAL rejection, the first Examiner's Answer and the second Examiner's Answer, the Examiner proffered several pages of analysis and legal discussion which, with due respect, have little relation to the appealed claims. Appellants did not earlier address these issues in detail because (1) the claimed invention on its merits is clearly and patentably distinguishable from the individual and combined teachings of the references of record (Appellants have made this abundantly clear in their detailed arguments already of record), (2) Appellants did not want to engage the Examiner in a costly and distracting debate over irrelevant matter, and (3) Appellants are mystified that the Examiner would continue to rely upon them at this late date. Unfortunately, Appellants are concerned that, by their silence to this point, it may be inferred by the Board that they concede the validity of those arguments. To make the record crystal clear, they most certainly do not.

1. Unclaimed "server structure" and its alleged "lack of new and unexpected results" and "scalability"

Beginning at page 5 and continuing to the end of the first complete paragraph on page 7 of the Examiner's Answers, the Examiner presents an extended discourse on issues of "new or unexpected results" and "scaling" relating to Appellants alleged "claimed server structure".

With due deference to the Examiner, none of Appellants' claims on appeal recite or expressly or impliedly refer to a "server structure", novel or otherwise, or to the "scalability"

of a server structure. Hence, the Examiner's arguments, including his elaborate mathematical and written dissertation on the legal functionality and equivalence of a single server versus multiple servers and the scalability thereof is utterly lost on Appellants (and, Appellants trust, the reviewing members of the Board).

2. The irrelevance of the Wilmes patent and alleged lack of support of the priority provisional applications for the use of ZIP + 6 postal codes for tax assessment purposes

This argument spans the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the Examiner's Answers and the first paragraph of page 8 thereof. Appellants do not contest that the provisional patent applications do not clearly disclose the concept of using ZIP + 6 postal codes for providing highly accurate point of sale tax assessment. However, the presently appealed application does, and this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Wilmes (as discussed in greater detail in Appellants' Brief).

3. Appellants have allegedly chosen "not to be their own lexicographer"

This argument extends from the middle of page 7 through page 10 of the Examiner's Answer. Neither Appellants nor the undersigned have understood the relevance of this argument, nor the Examiner's invitations to Appellants to be their own lexicographer, since it was first raised in the FINAL rejection. It is respectfully submitted that Appellants claims on appeal are what they are. They are neither unclear nor are they rejected as being unclear. As such, until this time Appellants

have quietly decided not to accept the Examiner's invitation "to be their own lexicographer" (whatever that may mean in the present context). Further, Appellants do not intend or desire to impute any meanings to their claim terms that extend beyond their ordinary meaning except as otherwise may be set forth in their specification, as is consistent with law.

4. The claims on appeal do not contain any product-by-process limitations

This argument spans all of page 10 and the first two lines of page 11 of the Examiner's Answers.


On this point, Appellants are in agreement with the Examiner. However, Appellants simply do not understand what bearing such a discussion has on the present appeal before the Board. The claims on appeal do not contain "product-by-process" limitations. Appellants are aware of that fact and are comfortable with it. Accordingly, Appellants have thus far quietly declined to accept the Examiner's invitation to address this issue to-date because it, quite frankly, has absolutely no bearing on the instant appeal or the patentability of the presently claimed invention versus the prior art.

To conclude, the foregoing remarks are limited to new objections/arguments that were raised in the Examiner's Answers and to replies to several clearly untenable arguments by the Examiner which, Appellants earnestly believe, should not have survived the first Examiner's Answer. Accordingly, for the reasons provided hereinabove, as well as in Appellants' Brief, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection of claims 156-176 and 178-224 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Johnson, et al.

Date: July 24, 2007



John F. Letchford
Registration No. 33,328

Archer & Greiner
A Professional Corporation
One Centennial Square
P.O. Box 3000
Haddonfield, NJ 08033-0968
Tel.: (856) 354-3013
Fax: (856) 795-0574
E-mail: jletchford@archerlaw.com

2721696v1



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: :
Kevin C. Johnson, et al. :
 :
Application No.: 09/881,533 :
 :
Filed: June 14, 2001 :
 :
For: SALES TAX ASSESSMENT, :
REMITTANCE AND COLLECTION SYSTEM :
 :
 :
Attorney Docket No.: TAX002.10002 :

Group Art Unit: 3627

Examiner: A.J. Fischer

I, John F. Letchford, Registration No. 33,328, certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 24, 2007.



John F. Letchford

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 41.41

This Reply Brief comes before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Board of Appeals and Interferences ("Board") in response to a "second" Examiner's Answer dated June 5, 2007 (and a substantially identical "first" Examiner's Answer dated July 18, 2007, collectively, "Examiner's Answers"). It does not include any new or non-admitted amendment or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence.

I. WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

Appellants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 156-170 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Chong (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,169).

II. RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Appellants have discussed the presently claimed invention and the details and merits of its several independent claims, claims 156, 157, 171, 184, 194, 214 and 220 at great length in their Appeal Brief dated June 2, 2006. Accordingly, in the interest of economy, the instant discussion is limited to (1) new objections/arguments raised in the Examiner's Answers and (2) certain discussions of facts and statements of law reasserted in the second Examiner's Answer that Appellants are justifiably concerned the Examiner would again raise given multiple opportunities to reconsider them in light of their obvious inapplicability to the claims on appeal.

A. NEW OBJECTIONS/ARGUMENTS

At page 14, lines 1-5, of the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 of the Examiner's Answers under the heading "(10) Response to Argument," the Examiner cites certain "discrepancies" in the Table spanning pages 26-35 of Appellants' Brief filed June 2, 2006. The Table in question was offered in response to an objection made by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection dated December 23, 2004. More specifically, the Table was offered in good faith in reply to the Examiner's odd assertion at page 6, ¶ 13 of the FINAL rejection that none of the claims 156-224 in the application (of which all but one

claim, claim 177, remains on appeal), find express support in the several provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority. That Table pointed out with specificity where support for the claimed invention was present in one or more of the six (6) provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority, and acknowledged where those provisional applications did not provide express support for a few of the claims on appeal.

The "discrepancies" identified by the Examiner at page 14 of the Examiner's Answers fall into two categories: (a) an objection based on the failure of provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 to show a "Figure 12" as suggested in the Table, and (b) an objection to the effect that another provisional patent from which Appellants' claim priority in the instant application, Serial No. 60/218,196, fails to offer specific support for certain subject matter called for in claim 170 on appeal.

1. Discrepancy (a)

The disputed Table was created with great time and care by the undersigned, and at considerable expense to Appellants, in response to the aforementioned objection raised by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection. That notwithstanding, the Examiner is correct, provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does not include a figure identified as "Figure 12." The undersigned hereby avers that any reference in the Table to "Figure 12" of Appellants' provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 was an inadvertent and unintentional typographical error. The undersigned extends his sincere apologies to the Examiner for any confusion or misunderstanding

that that typographical error may have been created in the Examiner's mind. That aside, the undersigned hereby reaffirms that provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does contain specific support for every other claim limitation for which it is cited in the Table.

2. Discrepancy (b)

The Examiner correctly notes that claim 170 on appeal requires "archiving said new client database on a computer-readable medium." The Examiner then states (with emphasis added in italics) "While the provisional [Serial No. 60/218,196] states, 'Upon date-tagging and saving, the respective client files are archived at step 16, a copy of the client database is returned to the client at step 18'" *thereby only giving support for the step of archiving and not providing support for what the database is archived on.* Appellants respectfully submit to the reviewing members of the Board will surely appreciate that the step of "saving" following the step of "date-tagging" quite clearly suggests to a person of even less than ordinary skill in the art of the present invention that the date-tagged and saved/archived information is archived "on a computer readable medium" as expressed in claim 170 on appeal. This is especially true since Appellants' entire invention -- as disclosed throughout the protracted history of the present application as well in its many predecessors -- is directed to a computer-based invention in which information is stored on a computer-readable medium.

B. REPEATED ERRORS OF FACTS AND LAW

In the FINAL rejection, the first Examiner's Answer and the second Examiner's Answer, the Examiner proffered several pages of analysis and legal discussion which, with due respect, have little relation to the appealed claims. Appellants did not earlier address these issues in detail because (1) the claimed invention on its merits is clearly and patentably distinguishable from the individual and combined teachings of the references of record (Appellants have made this abundantly clear in their detailed arguments already of record), (2) Appellants did not want to engage the Examiner in a costly and distracting debate over irrelevant matter, and (3) Appellants are mystified that the Examiner would continue to rely upon them at this late date. Unfortunately, Appellants are concerned that, by their silence to this point, it may be inferred by the Board that they concede the validity of those arguments. To make the record crystal clear, they most certainly do not.

1. Unclaimed "server structure" and its alleged "lack of new and unexpected results" and "scalability"

Beginning at page 5 and continuing to the end of the first complete paragraph on page 7 of the Examiner's Answers, the Examiner presents an extended discourse on issues of "new or unexpected results" and "scaling" relating to Appellants alleged "claimed server structure".

With due deference to the Examiner, none of Appellants' claims on appeal recite or expressly or impliedly refer to a "server structure", novel or otherwise, or to the "scalability"

of a server structure. Hence, the Examiner's arguments, including his elaborate mathematical and written dissertation on the legal functionality and equivalence of a single server versus multiple servers and the scalability thereof is utterly lost on Appellants (and, Appellants trust, the reviewing members of the Board).

2. The irrelevance of the Wilmes patent and alleged lack of support of the priority provisional applications for the use of ZIP + 6 postal codes for tax assessment purposes

This argument spans the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the Examiner's Answers and the first paragraph of page 8 thereof. Appellants do not contest that the provisional patent applications do not clearly disclose the concept of using ZIP + 6 postal codes for providing highly accurate point of sale tax assessment. However, the presently appealed application does, and this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Wilmes (as discussed in greater detail in Appellants' Brief).

3. Appellants have allegedly chosen "not to be their own lexicographer"

This argument extends from the middle of page 7 through page 10 of the Examiner's Answer. Neither Appellants nor the undersigned have understood the relevance of this argument, nor the Examiner's invitations to Appellants to be their own lexicographer, since it was first raised in the FINAL rejection. It is respectfully submitted that Appellants claims on appeal are what they are. They are neither unclear nor are they rejected as being unclear. As such, until this time Appellants

have quietly decided not to accept the Examiner's invitation "to be their own lexicographer" (whatever that may mean in the present context). Further, Appellants do not intend or desire to impute any meanings to their claim terms that extend beyond their ordinary meaning except as otherwise may be set forth in their specification, as is consistent with law.

4. The claims on appeal do not contain any product-by-process limitations

This argument spans all of page 10 and the first two lines of page 11 of the Examiner's Answers.


On this point, Appellants are in agreement with the Examiner. However, Appellants simply do not understand what bearing such a discussion has on the present appeal before the Board. The claims on appeal do not contain "product-by-process" limitations. Appellants are aware of that fact and are comfortable with it. Accordingly, Appellants have thus far quietly declined to accept the Examiner's invitation to address this issue to-date because it, quite frankly, has absolutely no bearing on the instant appeal or the patentability of the presently claimed invention versus the prior art.

To conclude, the foregoing remarks are limited to new objections/arguments that were raised in the Examiner's Answers and to replies to several clearly untenable arguments by the Examiner which, Appellants earnestly believe, should not have survived the first Examiner's Answer. Accordingly, for the reasons provided hereinabove, as well as in Appellants' Brief, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection of claims 156-176 and 178-224 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Johnson, et al.

Date: July 24, 2007



John F. Letchford
Registration No. 33,328

Archer & Greiner
A Professional Corporation
One Centennial Square
P.O. Box 3000
Haddonfield, NJ 08033-0968
Tel.: (856) 354-3013
Fax: (856) 795-0574
E-mail: jletchford@archerlaw.com

2721696v1




IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: :
Kevin C. Johnson, et al. :
 :
Application No.: 09/881,533 :
 :
Filed: June 14, 2001 :
 :
For: SALES TAX ASSESSMENT, :
REMITTANCE AND COLLECTION SYSTEM :
 :
 :
Attorney Docket No.: TAX002.10002 :

Group Art Unit: 3627

Examiner: A.J. Fischer

I, John F. Letchford, Registration No. 33,328, certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on July 24, 2007.



John F. Letchford

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 CFR § 41.41

This Reply Brief comes before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") Board of Appeals and Interferences ("Board") in response to a "second" Examiner's Answer dated June 5, 2007 (and a substantially identical "first" Examiner's Answer dated July 18, 2007, collectively, "Examiner's Answers"). It does not include any new or non-admitted amendment or any new or non-admitted affidavit or other evidence.

I. WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS

Appellants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's withdrawal of the final rejection of claims 156-170 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Chong (U.S. Patent No. 5,335,169).

II. RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

Appellants have discussed the presently claimed invention and the details and merits of its several independent claims, claims 156, 157, 171, 184, 194, 214 and 220 at great length in their Appeal Brief dated June 2, 2006. Accordingly, in the interest of economy, the instant discussion is limited to (1) new objections/arguments raised in the Examiner's Answers and (2) certain discussions of facts and statements of law reasserted in the second Examiner's Answer that Appellants are justifiably concerned the Examiner would again raise given multiple opportunities to reconsider them in light of their obvious inapplicability to the claims on appeal.

A. NEW OBJECTIONS/ARGUMENTS

At page 14, lines 1-5, of the paragraph bridging pages 13 and 14 of the Examiner's Answers under the heading "(10) Response to Argument," the Examiner cites certain "discrepancies" in the Table spanning pages 26-35 of Appellants' Brief filed June 2, 2006. The Table in question was offered in response to an objection made by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection dated December 23, 2004. More specifically, the Table was offered in good faith in reply to the Examiner's odd assertion at page 6, ¶ 13 of the FINAL rejection that *none* of the claims 156-224 in the application (of which all but one

claim, claim 177, remains on appeal), find express support in the several provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority. That Table pointed out with specificity where support for the claimed invention was present in one or more of the six (6) provisional patent applications from which the present application claims priority, and acknowledged where those provisional applications did not provide express support for a few of the claims on appeal.

The "discrepancies" identified by the Examiner at page 14 of the Examiner's Answers fall into two categories: (a) an objection based on the failure of provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 to show a "Figure 12" as suggested in the Table, and (b) an objection to the effect that another provisional patent from which Appellants' claim priority in the instant application, Serial No. 60/218,196, fails to offer specific support for certain subject matter called for in claim 170 on appeal.

1. Discrepancy (a)

The disputed Table was created with great time and care by the undersigned, and at considerable expense to Appellants, in response to the aforementioned objection raised by the Examiner in the FINAL rejection. That notwithstanding, the Examiner is correct, provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does not include a figure identified as "Figure 12." The undersigned hereby avers that any reference in the Table to "Figure 12" of Appellants' provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 was an inadvertent and unintentional typographical error. The undersigned extends his sincere apologies to the Examiner for any confusion or misunderstanding

that that typographical error may have been created in the Examiner's mind. That aside, the undersigned hereby reaffirms that provisional patent application Serial No. 60/211,625 does contain specific support for every other claim limitation for which it is cited in the Table.

2. Discrepancy (b)

The Examiner correctly notes that claim 170 on appeal requires "archiving said new client database on a computer-readable medium." The Examiner then states (with emphasis added in italics) "While the provisional [Serial No. 60/218,196] states, 'Upon date-tagging and saving, the respective client files are archived at step 16, a copy of the client database is returned to the client at step 18'" *thereby only giving support for the step of archiving and not providing support for what the database is archived on.* Appellants respectfully submit to the reviewing members of the Board will surely appreciate that the step of "saving" following the step of "date-tagging" quite clearly suggests to a person of even less than ordinary skill in the art of the present invention that the date-tagged and saved/archived information is archived "on a computer readable medium" as expressed in claim 170 on appeal. This is especially true since Appellants' entire invention -- as disclosed throughout the protracted history of the present application as well in its many predecessors -- is directed to a computer-based invention in which information is stored on a computer-readable medium.

B. REPEATED ERRORS OF FACTS AND LAW

In the FINAL rejection, the first Examiner's Answer and the second Examiner's Answer, the Examiner proffered several pages of analysis and legal discussion which, with due respect, have little relation to the appealed claims. Appellants did not earlier address these issues in detail because (1) the claimed invention on its merits is clearly and patentably distinguishable from the individual and combined teachings of the references of record (Appellants have made this abundantly clear in their detailed arguments already of record), (2) Appellants did not want to engage the Examiner in a costly and distracting debate over irrelevant matter, and (3) Appellants are mystified that the Examiner would continue to rely upon them at this late date. Unfortunately, Appellants are concerned that, by their silence to this point, it may be inferred by the Board that they concede the validity of those arguments. To make the record crystal clear, they most certainly do not.

1. Unclaimed "server structure" and its alleged "lack of new and unexpected results" and "scalability"

Beginning at page 5 and continuing to the end of the first complete paragraph on page 7 of the Examiner's Answers, the Examiner presents an extended discourse on issues of "new or unexpected results" and "scaling" relating to Appellants alleged "claimed server structure".

With due deference to the Examiner, none of Appellants' claims on appeal recite or expressly or impliedly refer to a "server structure", novel or otherwise, or to the "scalability"

of a server structure. Hence, the Examiner's arguments, including his elaborate mathematical and written dissertation on the legal functionality and equivalence of a single server versus multiple servers and the scalability thereof is utterly lost on Appellants (and, Appellants trust, the reviewing members of the Board).

2. The irrelevance of the Wilmes patent and alleged lack of support of the priority provisional applications for the use of ZIP + 6 postal codes for tax assessment purposes

This argument spans the paragraph bridging pages 7 and 8 of the Examiner's Answers and the first paragraph of page 8 thereof. Appellants do not contest that the provisional patent applications do not clearly disclose the concept of using ZIP + 6 postal codes for providing highly accurate point of sale tax assessment. However, the presently appealed application does, and this feature is not disclosed or suggested by Wilmes (as discussed in greater detail in Appellants' Brief).

3. Appellants have allegedly chosen "not to be their own lexicographer"

This argument extends from the middle of page 7 through page 10 of the Examiner's Answer. Neither Appellants nor the undersigned have understood the relevance of this argument, nor the Examiner's invitations to Appellants to be their own lexicographer, since it was first raised in the FINAL rejection. It is respectfully submitted that Appellants claims on appeal are what they are. They are neither unclear nor are they rejected as being unclear. As such, until this time Appellants

have quietly decided not to accept the Examiner's invitation "to be their own lexicographer" (whatever that may mean in the present context). Further, Appellants do not intend or desire to impute any meanings to their claim terms that extend beyond their ordinary meaning except as otherwise may be set forth in their specification, as is consistent with law.

4. The claims on appeal do not contain any product-by-process limitations

This argument spans all of page 10 and the first two lines of page 11 of the Examiner's Answers.

On this point, Appellants are in agreement with the Examiner. However, Appellants simply do not understand what bearing such a discussion has on the present appeal before the Board. The claims on appeal do not contain "product-by-process" limitations. Appellants are aware of that fact and are comfortable with it. Accordingly, Appellants have thus far quietly declined to accept the Examiner's invitation to address this issue to-date because it, quite frankly, has absolutely no bearing on the instant appeal or the patentability of the presently claimed invention versus the prior art.

To conclude, the foregoing remarks are limited to new objections/arguments that were raised in the Examiner's Answers and to replies to several clearly untenable arguments by the Examiner which, Appellants earnestly believe, should not have survived the first Examiner's Answer. Accordingly, for the reasons provided hereinabove, as well as in Appellants' Brief, it is respectfully requested that the final rejection of claims 156-176 and 178-224 be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Kevin C. Johnson, et al.

Date: July 24, 2007



John F. Letchford
Registration No. 33,328

Archer & Greiner
A Professional Corporation
One Centennial Square
P.O. Box 3000
Haddonfield, NJ 08033-0968
Tel.: (856) 354-3013
Fax: (856) 795-0574
E-mail: jletchford@archerlaw.com

2721696v1